

REMARKS

Examiner is thanked for carefully reviewing the present application. The present amendment is in response to the first Office Action mailed on December 19, 2005 regarding claims 1-15.

Favorable reconsideration is requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-5, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Satoh (US 6895228). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Referring to Fig. 1, as explicitly recited in claim 1, the claimed invention discloses a switchable high frequency **bandpass filter (BPF)** comprising a switchable LC resonator 101 and a switch signal input interface 102. Since the claimed invention is directed to a BPF, the switchable LC resonator 101 is definitely a circuit for providing a plurality of switchable **BPF transfer functions** for a plurality of high frequency signals S1 and S2. Further, a switch signal SW is input to the switch signal input interface 102 for controlling switchable LC resonator 101 to select a proper part of the circuit therein to provide a suitable **BPF transfer function** for the high frequency signal S1 or S2, such as one part shown in Fig. 2(a) for the high frequency signal S2; and the other part shown in Fig. 2(b) for the high frequency signal S1.

In contrast, as stated in column 2, lines 36-38, Satoh teaches a **low-pass filter (LPF)** with a high pass filter (HPF section 3) in a high frequency (see Fig. 1 and Fig. 2) or with a BPF section 31 (see Fig. 7 and Fig. 8); and a switch circuit included in the HPF section 3 or the BPF section 31 to change the HPF section 3 or the BPF section 31 to the rejection or the pass band, i.e. Satoh's switch circuit is used to control whether the HPF section 3 or the BPF section 31 should be functioned in addition to the LPF section 4 and/or the LPF section 5(or 32). Further,

it is noted that Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 are the detailed circuits illustrating the embodiments shown in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2, and thus the circuits shown in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 can be briefly explained in view of Fig. 1 and Fig. 2, wherein Fig. 4 is mainly used by Examiner for rejection reasons.

Apparently, Satoh's patent is a LPF but not a BPF as recited in the claimed invention, so that Satoh's circuit is the LPF section(s) with additionally the HPF section or the BPF section for providing LPF transfer functions, but the switchable LC resonator taught in claimed 1 of the claimed invention is purely a BPF for providing LPF transfer functions. Further, Satoh's switch circuit is used to decide if the entire filter (the LPF section(s) and the HPF section or the BPF section) or one part of the filter (the LPF section(s)) should participate in the operation, but the switch signal input interface taught in claim 1 of the claimed invention is used to decide which part of the controlling switchable LC resonator should be used alone to handle one of the high frequency signals. Therefore, the layout and function of Satoh's filter circuit is different from those of the switchable LC resonator of the claimed invention; and the layout and function of Satoh's switch circuit is different from those of the switch signal input interface of the claimed invention.

The Federal Circuit reiterated that "a rejection for anticipation under section 102 requires that each and every limitation of the claimed invention be disclosed in a single prior art reference." In re Paulsen, 31 USPQ 2d 1671 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Accordingly, since Satoh does not disclose the switchable LC resonator and the switch signal input interface as taught in the claimed invention, claim 1 of the claimed invention cannot be anticipated by Satoh.

With regard to claims 2-5, 11 and 12, since claim 1 is allowable, dependent claims 2-5, 11 and 12 each of which depends from independent claim 1 are likewise believed to be allowable.

Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the section 102(e) rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Satoh in view of Damgaard et al. (US6208875). Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Satoh in view of Watanable et al. (US6937845). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Just as described above, Satoh does not teach or suggest the switchable LC resonator and the switch signal input interface as taught in the claimed invention. Therefore, claims 6-10 and 13-15 are not obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the section 103(a) rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, all objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If there are any remaining issues to be resolved, the applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview.

If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. JLINP166).

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP



Albert S. Penilla, Esq.
Reg. No. 39,487

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
Tel: (408) 774-6903
Fax: (408) 749-6901
Customer No. 25920